

1
2
3
4
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7
8

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9

AIMEE SHEMANO-KRUPP,

10

Plaintiff,

No. C 05-04693 JSW

11

v.

12

MUTUAL OF OMAHA INSURANCE
COMPANY, et al.,

13

Defendants.

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE
MULTIPLE MOTIONS FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

14

15

Having received four motions for summary judgment set to be heard on May 26, 2006 at 9:00 a.m., the Court HEREBY ISSUES this order to show cause why the Court should deviate from its Standing Order ¶ 8 which provides that with respect to motions for summary judgment, “[a]ll issues shall be contained within one motion, may not exceed twenty-five pages in length, and shall conform with Civil Local Rule 7-2.” After only a brief preliminary review of the four recently-filed motions, both parties appear to move for summary judgment on the same issues, and each party submits two motions each to raise their concerns. There appears to be significant overlap and redundancy in the four motions. In order to preserve judicial resources, the Court requires by its Standing Orders that each party file only one motion for summary judgment per case, in the absence of a showing of good cause. Further, it is the custom of this Court to require the parties to meet and confer in order to establish that cross-motions for summary judgment do not significantly overlap in substance, and to brief in opposition to a motion by the party with the burden of proof on any given issue, instead of resolving fully-briefed cross-motions on the identical issue.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Therefore, by no later than April 28, 2006, the parties shall file a written response to this
2 Order showing cause (1) why the Court should not strike the current motions for failure to
3 comply with this Court's standing order permitting only one motion for summary judgment per
4 party; (2) whether the parties' current briefing best preserves the resources of this Court; and (3)
5 a proposal, including a schedule for briefing, which addresses the Court's concerns.

6

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8

9 Dated: April 24, 2006


10 _____
11 JEFFREY S. WHITE
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28